

(Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we have seen little press coverage in the United States of the World Trade Organization before its ministerial beginning this week in Cancun, Mexico. But around the globe, the WTO's 5th Ministerial is a big story. The divide between WTO nations about its future is coming into public view. At stake in Cancun is the future of the World Trade Organization and how it will implement corporate globalization. Success or failure depends on which side of the divide countries stand. Given that the most powerful countries of the WTO, partnering with the supposedly neutral WTO Secretariat, have set the meeting's agenda to suit their goals. There can be no good outcome.

The best result is what the U.S. media may report as a "failure." The small block of powerful nations fail to steamroll the majority of the WTO's members who are developing nations, and the summit ends in deadlock. The problem is that the U.S., the European Union, Japan, and a handful of other rich nations want the WTO to be "the constitution for a single global economy," a description that the first WTO Director General famously uttered in a moment of unguarded candor.

They want the WTO to enforce one-size-fits-all rules on an array of issues ranging far beyond trade which all WTO countries must adopt as their domestic practices. These broad WTO rules would implement worldwide what has become known as the "Washington Consensus."

While this agenda has proven to be a devastating failure; its agenda of eliminating a role for Government and public interest regulation of the market, establishing new property rights and protections for corporate interests, of creating tradable units out of vital public services, privatizing water, supplies, all of that, genetic materials and common resources, is at the heart of the WTO, which currently enforces 18 expansive agreements implementing this version of corporate-led globalization. Yet to the world's largest corporations and their client governments, this is only the beginning.

The U.S., the European Union, Japan, and others are pushing for decisions in Cancun to add to the WTO extreme terms that are now only contained in the clearly failed North American Free Trade Agreement. These new issues include expansive new investor rights, rules on government procurement eliminating local or environmental preferences, undercutting domestic environmental food safety laws, and new rights for foreign service corporations to turn Government services such as water treatment facilities, how we get our water, into for-profit foreign or domestic corporations.

Meanwhile, an increasingly consolidated block of developing nations have a different view. These nations want the WTO to deal simply with trade,

World Trade Organization, and do so in a way that benefits all of the WTO nations, not just the most powerful and the richest countries.

While different developing nations have different ideas about fair trade, they are united in opposing any expansion of the WTO into these new areas outside of just trade. When the Uruguay Round in 1994 created the WTO, developing countries were promised major gains. They were promised that industrialized nations would lower and eventually eliminate tariffs on items like textiles and apparel and cut agriculture subsidies that have enabled huge agribusinesses to dominate the world market. They were promised the WTO would be good for development in the poor countries. Newspapers and opinion shapers largely endorsed the ideas and promoted it.

As the WTO, however, moves forward on new issues of negotiations, these promises remain utterly unfulfilled. If the WTO is to maintain trade credibility as a trade organization rather than evolving into the CHO, the Corporate Handout Organization, it must revisit the issues that affect developing nations before adding to its agenda and it must stop pandering to the largest, most powerful multinational corporations in the world.

ULTRASOUND SURVEY RESULTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor to talk about my bill H.R. 195, which is the Informed Choice Act. The results of a recent survey commissioned by Care Net of 802 female registered voters nationwide unequivocally demonstrate that women coast to coast, and from all walks of life, agree that providing ultrasound technology for women's health centers is an important and worthwhile cause. It is clear that these women view ultrasound as an essential resource for women who are faced with unplanned pregnancies and the related decision to either terminate or to continue that pregnancy.

Nearly nine in 10, 87 percent of women, said it is important for non-profit women's health centers to provide ultrasound services, including a considerable majority, 64 percent, who believe this is a very important priority.

A majority of female registered voters believe that women facing crisis pregnancies would benefit from having access to ultrasound. Over half, 51 percent of those surveyed, said that women who are considering abortions should have access to ultrasound consistent with the rest of the prior to finalizing their decisions. In contrast, just 31 percent claim that seeing an image of what is inside would make such a decision more difficult.

Mr. Speaker, it is clearly the belief of these women that ultrasound provides understanding, not uncertainty. It is with this new information in mind that I remind my colleagues about my bill, H.R. 195, "The Informed Choice Act." I have introduced this legislation authorizing HHS to establish grants for which nonprofit health clinics could apply and, if awarded, purchase the needed ultrasound equipment. Many uninsured women are prohibited from finding the health care they need because the free health clinics to which they have access are unable to provide medical services because of the lack of funds to purchase such medical equipment. The mother is, therefore, forced to wander from one clinic to another in search of the services that she so desperately needs. Enabling these health clinics to purchase ultrasound equipment would be a persuasive push in the direction of transitioning from a health clinic to a medical facility.

The advantages of ultrasound are many. It is fast and relatively cheap, costing about \$50 per exam. Ultrasound exams are performed at about 10 to 14 weeks of the pregnancy and are considered the best way to gauge growth before birth. Ultrasound can diagnose heart problems in the unborn child, find neural tube defects including spina bifida, and determine the position of the placenta. There is even now an ultrasound piece of equipment that can provide a 3-D image that can rotate 360 degrees to see all sides of the baby.

My legislation will ensure that doctors can provide critical information to mothers in the decision-making process regarding their pregnancies. Nothing in my bill makes ideology regarding abortion a condition for the grant. Whether a center offers abortion or abortion alternatives, the clinic is eligible so long as it meets the criteria set forth in the bill.

In the controversy today over abortion in America, emotionally charged rhetoric clouds the issue and does damage, I think, to the efforts made on behalf of mother and child. No matter one's conviction concerning abortion, we can all agree that the mother deserves as much information as is available in making this solemn decision. Information is the best weapon in diffusing the volatile discussion and returning us to our first concern, which is the health of the mother and child. The ultrasound equipment is a valuable tool in expanding the debate beyond traditional platitudes on both sides of the argument.

Modern medicine has provided us with a window into the womb. These advances in technology empower women with as much information as possible regarding their pregnancy. The goal of my legislation is to provide women who find themselves with an unplanned pregnancy with the full scope of information such that they may finally make an informed choice.

This bill is about the dissemination of information. The bill is about extending more free services to women

and about making available this vital technology to the very poor women as well as to the rich.

So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, there are times when people of good faith who differ on an issue can come together and find a place to agree. I believe my legislation, H.R. 195, brings us beyond the shrill arguments regarding abortion and makes a meaningful effort to care for the mother and the child.

THE TIME FOR TRUTH AND CANDOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, President Bush's televised speech on Sunday night, calling for tens of billions of dollars in additional funding to support the U.S. occupation of Iraq, was extremely disappointing, disappointing because the President failed to explain to the American people the details on how he is going to change this failing policy.

It is clear that his administration rushed to war with too little thought given to the implications of an American occupation of Iraq. We were not welcomed with open arms as some administration officials have predicted. On the front page of today's Washington Post is an article entitled "Spy Agencies Warned of Iraq Resistance," detailing how U.S. intelligence agencies warned the Bush Administration before the war that there would be significant armed opposition to a U.S.-led occupation. In all the many briefings I attended, I do not recall any administration official sharing that information. We have not found the weapons of mass destruction that we were told existed in such abundance.

And while the administration continues to link Iraq to the terrible tragedy of September 11, so far it has produced no evidence to support such a claim. In fact, the occupation of Iraq has increased the terrorist presence in that country, not lessened it.

On Sunday night President Bush had the opportunity to tell the American people of his plan, including his exit strategy for the brave American men and women who are serving in Iraq with such incredible distinction. Instead, the President detailed nothing.

This is a war that should never have happened. As awful as Saddam Hussein was, he was not an imminent or direct threat to the people of the United States. Months into the war, the Congress and the American people are still waiting to hear a clear, consistent and convincing justification for it. Why did we need to invade Iraq? What was so urgent that it required us to go to war when we did? Why could we not have spent the necessary time to build an international consensus on how to best

deal with Saddam? What was so threatening to our country that made this Congress spend only 1 day, 1 day debating the authorization authorizing war?

As of today, 284 brave young Americans have lost their lives and 1,450 have been wounded. And in preparation for this war, this Chamber could only manage to devote a single day in October debating it. That is shameful.

Now the President says he wants another \$87 billion and expects everyone to just go along, no questions asked. Mr. Speaker, like so many people throughout this country, I have a lot of questions and I am not prepared to just go along. I want to make sure that American troops have all the resources they need and I am not advocating that we walk away from our obligation to the people of Iraq. However, I also want to make certain that the hard-earned tax dollars of the American people are not wasted on more of the same. I have no problem with helping Iraq build hospitals, health clinics, schools, roads and housing. But I do have a problem with the lack of support by this administration for the building of hospitals and health clinics, schools, roads, and housing right here in the United States.

Why did the President not tell us on Sunday that in the face of this enormous price tag, he is willing to forego his tax cut for millionaires so that we can avoid going deeper into debt? If this is a time for sacrifice, then why do the people in the income bracket of President Bush and Vice President CHENEY not have to make any sacrifice? I cannot vote for 87 billion additional dollars without some accountability and some clarification. What is the plan? How long are we going to be there? Eighty-seven billion dollars is for just 1 year. What about next year or the year after that? How is the \$87 billion going to be spent? How were the \$79 billion we appropriated in April spent? We are now at \$166 billion and counting.

The President wants us to spend \$87 billion more mostly for Iraq. For months some of us have been trying to get just \$1.8 billion more for our veterans' health care only to be told by the administration that there is not enough money. We have been trying to get \$7 billion so that the Pell grant program fully lives up to its promise and students are not buried under a mountain of debt. The administration says no. We have been trying to get just \$300 million to fund the Global Food for Education Initiative, to provide a nutritious meal in a school setting for millions of children, but the administration tells us that the money just is not there.

The American people need to know what is at stake here. They need to know about the choices the administration is asking us to make. This is a time for truth and candor. We have had enough spin. We have had enough deception. This is also the time for this Congress to do what it failed to do be-

fore the war: ask the tough questions, demand the straight answers, and debate thoughtfully the implications of what we are doing. We must be more than a rubber stamp, and I would urge my colleagues respectfully to proceed with caution.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, my intention is to talk about the need for a prescription drug benefit for seniors under Medicare, but when I listened to the previous speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), he made it a point about the President's speech on Sunday night about how this \$87 billion in new funding that the President is requesting for Iraq is going to have a direct impact on domestic programs, and I have to say it was very disturbing to me today to read in the New York Times in the lead story on the front page that some Republicans were suggesting that because of the additional needs for Iraq as outlined in the President's speech that maybe some of them would now reconsider whether they would support a prescription drug benefit for seniors.

Let me tell the Members the Republican leadership in this House as well as the President have been saying for over 2 years that they are going to provide a prescription drug benefit for seniors and there is no reason not to do it. The notion that somehow now we do not have enough money for it is bogus, given the fact that the Republicans passed all these tax cuts, a series of three tax cuts that now have put us into a deficit. In addition to that, the fact of the matter is if they were willing, which they have not been, to provide some kind of cost controls or some requirement that part of the Medicare prescription drug program would assume that the Secretary would negotiate lower prices for discounts, we would be able to afford a good prescription drug benefit.

I do not want to hear and I am not willing to listen to those Republicans who are going to tell us over the next few months that we cannot afford a prescription drug benefit. It is their own policies that have put us into this deficit situation. It is their own policies that make it difficult for us to negotiate any kind of price reductions or put any kind of price controls in effect because they oppose it ideologically.

It is interesting because earlier this week there was another article in New York Times that talked about the VA programs and how successful the veterans program has been in trying to keep costs down for prescription drugs, and that is because they negotiate price reductions. They insist as part of the VA program that when they buy